

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 29, 2003, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. The amendments place existing claims in independent form and thus no new issues are raised. Entry of this amendment is proper after final rejection.

Claim Objections

Claim 48 was objected to for informalities. Claim 48 has been amended to correct its dependency from claim 51. Thus, withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 5-22, 25-45, 48-57 and 61-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by Hanson et al., US 6,535,585 (hereinafter "Hanson") for the reasons stated on pages 2-9 of the Office Action.

Claims 7, 8 and 9 have been placed in independent form. Hanson fails to teach or suggest the features claimed in claims 7, 8 and 9.

In Hanson, a notification is generated to the calling only upon two occurrences, either the delivery of the message or cancellation of the message. As described in Hanson, the cancellation of the message corresponds to a failure to deliver the message (See column 5, line 51 to column 6, line 29). Thus, only message delivery and failure of message delivery (referred to as cancellation) are taught in Hanson as conditions for generating a status notification to the calling party.

Claims 7, 8 and 9 recites numerous additional conditions that trigger a status notification. The Examiner states that the triggering event and the disposition event are disclosed in column 6, lines 3-12 and column 5, lines 15-31 of Hanson, respectively. However, Applicants cannot find the corresponding triggering or disposition events in Hanson.

Accordingly, Hanson does not disclose or teach all of the elements of claims 7, 8 and 9, and does not anticipate claims 7-9. Claims 5 and 10-20 variously depend from claim 7 and are patentable over Hanson as well.

Claims 28-30 and 51-53 have been placed in independent form and are patentable over Hanson for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claims 7-9.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 58 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Skladman et al., US 6,498,835 (hereinafter "Skladman") for the reasons stated on pages 10-11 of the Office Action. Skladman does not cure the deficiencies of Hanson described above with reference to claim 51. Accordingly, the combination of Hanson and Skladman does not render obvious claims 58 and 60.

Thus, withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

OFFICIAL

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 12 2003

Date: September 11, 2003

BS01045
BLT-0054